

The USPTO objected to the drawings because Figures 1-4 should be designed by a legend such as --Prior Art--. With all respect to the Examiner, the drawing objections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to Figure 1-4 and to their designation of --Related Art--. Applicants assert that the designation --Related Art-- fulfills the requirements of MPEP §608.02(g). The Examiner's attention is asked to note the "*such as*" [italics added] language of MPEP §608.02(g).

The USPTO further objected to the drawings because element 15 in Figures 5 and 7 appears as a blackened polarizer 12 (not enabled) rather than a black coating on the polarizer, or a black film printed on the polarizer (both enabled). In response, Applicant traverse the position that a blackened polarizer 12 is not enabled, but submits proposed drawings that incorporate a black layer (such as ink or film) on the polarizer 12.

Traversal of the position that the blackened polarizer 12 is not enabled is based on the fact that there is no reason that a coated film or ink could not soak into, or fill pores in, the polarizer (resulting in the illustrated blackened polarizer). Furthermore, since the drawings are part of the originally filed application, a blackened polarizer is enabled. Additionally, claim 1 as originally filed did not require a coating for printed ink. Finally, page 8; line 6 makes clear that the light shielding film could be in the polarizer.

However, Applicants submit proposed new drawings to better support the originally filed and newly added claims.

The USPTO rejected claims 1 and 4 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sugimoto et al. JP 59-154424. In response, Applicant cancels claims 1-5 and asserts the patentability of new claims 6-11.

The Examiner's attention is directed to Sugimoto's specific teaching of a reflecting layer 18. However, the subject application teaches avoiding reflections, and, to that end, incorporates an absorbing light shielding film, reference the subject application, page 7, lines 13-18. Furthermore, the new claim 6 specifies a light shielding film that absorbs light. Thus, claim 6

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

is allowable. Since claims 7-11 depend from claim 6, those claims are also allowable.

The USPTO also rejected claims 1-5 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Dingwall et al, US 5,307,188. In response, Applicant cancels claims 1-5 and asserts the patentability of new claims 6-11.

The Examiner's attention is directed to Dingwall's direct teaching of multiple liquid crystal displays, a primary liquid crystal display 234 and a secondary liquid crystal display 232, reference Dingwall, column 7, lines 52-59. The Examiner's attention is further directed to the fact that the opaque surround 235 is on the primary liquid crystal display 234, while the light source 224 is opposite the lower polarizer of the secondary liquid crystal display 232, reference Figure 2 of Dingwall.

In contrast, the subject application teaches and claims a backlight unit that is disposed opposite the lower polarizer, with the lower polarizer having a light shielding film, and the light shielding film being disposed in the periphery of the LCD panel (see Fig. 5 and note the rectangular shape). The Examiner's attention is also directed to Figure 7 of the subject application. Furthermore, the light shielding film is described on page 7, lines 13-18, as decreasing the reflection of light from the backlight device. Indeed, the position of the lower polarizer prevents light leakage that may occur in the peripheral portion of the LCD panel. Finally, the new claim 6 specifies that the backlight unit is disposed opposite the lower polarizer, and that the lower polarizer has the light shielding film. Thus, claim 6 is allowable. Furthermore, since claims 7-11 depend from claim 6, those claims are also allowable.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant believes that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and reexamine the subject application. An early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone call would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY
then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: August 1, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

By John M. Kelly
John M. Kelly
Registration No.: 33,920
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500